

Title	Mu#āwiyah, Constans II and coins without crosses
Authors	Woods, David
Publication date	2015-12
Original Citation	Woods, D. (2015) 'Mu#āwiyah, Constans II and coins without crosses', Israel Numismatic Research, 10, pp. 169-181.
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	http://www.ins.org.il/47/
Rights	© 2015, Israel Numismatic Society.
Download date	2023-05-07 21:58:20
Item downloaded from	http://hdl.handle.net/10468/9582



Israel Numismatic Research

10 | 2015

*Published by
The Israel Numismatic Society*

Israel Numismatic Research

Published by the Israel Numismatic Society

Volume 10

2015

Contents

- 5 PAOLO VISONÀ: A Missing Link in the Last Carthaginian Gold Series
- 9 ERIC A. CARLEN AND CATHARINE C. LORBER: A Die Shared by the Ptolemaic Mints at Sidon and 'Akko-Ptolemais
- 37 HAIM GITLER AND GÉRALD FINKIELSZTEJN: An Official Hellenistic Inscribed Disk from Ascalon (with an appendix by Naama Yahalom-Mack, Haim Gitler, Ofir Tirosh and Yigal Erel: Bulk Chemical Composition of the Disk Naming Ascalon; and an appendix by Dana Ashkenazi and Haim Gitler: Metallurgical SEM-EDS Characterization of the Disk Naming Ascalon)
- 55 GÉRALD FINKIELSZTEJN: The Weight Standards of the Hellenistic Levant, Part Two: The Evidence of the Phoenician Scale Weights
- 105 OLIVER D. HOOVER: A Clashed Seleucid Obverse Die of Philip I Philadelphus
- 111 AARON J. KOGON: Greek Letter Forms on Judean Coins
- 129 JEAN-PHILIPPE FONTANILLE AND AARON J. KOGON: Two New Symbols on a Coin of Herod Antipas
- 137 YOAV FARHI: Die Sharing and Other Numismatic Connections in Southern Roman Palestine (Second–Third Centuries CE)
- 155 ACHIM LICHTENBERGER: Orientation Matters: The Obverse Portrait of Elagabalus on Some Civic Coins of Abila and Other Syrian Coins
- 169 DAVID WOODS: Mu'awiya, Constans II and Coins without Crosses
- 183 NIKOLAUS SCHINDEL: The Umayyad *Fulūs* of Gaza
- 191 NITZAN AMITAI-PREISS AND OREN TAL: A Lead Bulla from Apollonia-Arsūf with the Place Name Arsūf (with an appendix by Dana Ashkenazi and Oren Tal: Archaeometallurgical Characteristics of the Bulla)
- 207 STEFAN HEIDEMANN AND ROBERT KOOL: A Bedouin *Amīr* in Fāṭimid Ṭabariyya: The Earliest Numayrid Coin Excavated in Tiberias
- 215 ROBERT KOOL AND OREN TAL: 'Underground' Money in an *Outremer* Estate: Token Molds and Lead Tokens from Crusader Arsur
- 229 REVIEW: Ya'akov Meshorer, with Gabriela Bijovsky and Wolfgang Fischer-Bossert. *Coins of the Holy Land. The Abraham and Marian Sofaer Collection at the American Numismatic Society and the Israel Museum*. Edited by David Hendin and Andrew Meadows (Ancient Coins in North American Collections 8). The American Numismatic Society, New York 2013 (DANNY SYON)
- 235 Abbreviations

Mu'āwiyah, Constans II and Coins without Crosses

DAVID WOODS

University College Cork

d.woods@ucc.ie

Abstract

A newly published type of *hexagram* of Constans II with reverse depicting three standing figures rather than a cross-on-globe-on-steps, when taken together with the *solidus* of the same type, suggests that the author of the *Maronite Chronicle* may have been mistakenly referring to these coins when he claimed that the caliph Mu'āwiyah struck gold and silver coins without crosses upon his accession at Jerusalem in 661.

The final fragments of the so-called *Maronite Chronicle*¹ preserve a series of notices for the Seleucid Era (Anno Graecorum) years AG 969–975 (657/8–663/4 CE), where the second part of the notice for AG 971 (659/60 CE) has drawn the attention of numismatists because of its potential contribution to the history of Arab-Byzantine coinage:

In July of the same year the emirs and many Arabs gathered and proffered their right hand to Mu'āwiyah. Then an order went out that he should be proclaimed king in all the villages and cities of his dominion and that they should make acclamations and invocations to him. He also minted gold and silver, but it was not accepted, because it had no cross on it. Furthermore, Mu'āwiyah did not wear a crown like other kings in the world. He placed his throne in Damascus and refused to go to Muhammad's throne" (translation from Palmer 1993:32).

The task facing numismatists is to reconcile what this relatively early and well-informed source has to say about the striking of coinage by Mu'āwiyah upon his accession as caliph (661–680 CE) and the actual numismatic evidence.² The general assumption has been that the anonymous author of this source is correct in his allegation that Mu'āwiyah struck gold coinage without a cross (Morrisson 1992:312; Foss 2002:362–363; *SICA* I:91; Foss 2008:41; Foss 2010:86; Hoyland 2015:131). This is because a hoard deposited probably during the last years of

1 The *Maronite Chronicle* is a fragmentary Maronite work probably written sometime during the last quarter of the seventh century CE. See, in general, Hoyland 1997:135–139.

2 For a detailed analysis of the other elements within this account, see Marsham 2013.

Constantine IV (668–685) at Daphne near Antioch in Syria contained an imitation of a *solidus* of Heraclius where the cross-bar of the cross on the reverse had been removed, as had those of the various smaller crosses on the obverse also (Metcalf 1980:96). Hence the general assumption has been that Muʿāwiyah was in some way responsible for this and other imitations of Byzantine *solidi* where the crosses had been deformed in this way.

However, the allegation that Muʿāwiyah also struck silver coins without a cross is much more problematic because silver coinage was not struck in Syria until the mint at Damascus began to produce Sasanian-style *drachms* under the Caliph ʿAbd al-Malik in AH 72/ 691/2 CE (Ilisch 2007:17–19). Therefore, some argue that if the author of the *Maronite Chronicle* has not mistakenly attributed the coinage reforms of ʿAbd al-Malik during the mid-690s CE to Muʿāwiyah, then he was influenced by these reforms to assume that Muʿāwiyah must have tried something similar (Bates 1992:319; Heidemann 2010:28). Alternatively, Foss preferred to explain the claim that Muʿāwiyah struck silver coins without a cross in reference to an attempted importation into Syria of Sasanian-style *drachms* struck elsewhere (Foss 2002:362; 2008:39; 2010:86).

The argument that this source refers to both the striking of *solidi* upon which the cross has been deformed and the importation into Syria of Sasanian-style *drachms* suffers from two weaknesses. First, the clear implication of the allegation that Muʿāwiyah had struck gold and silver coins without a cross is that he had intended these in continuation of coins that normally bore crosses previously. Thus one cannot reasonably interpret this allegation in reference to the importation of Sasanian-style *drachms* into Syria because these *drachms* never depicted crosses (Bates 1992:319). Second, the deforming of a cross upon a coin by the removal of its cross-bar is not the same thing as removing it altogether from the coin.³ Hence it is unlikely that this allegation refers to the striking of the *solidi* with deformed crosses. As for the alternative explanation, that the author of the chronicle has mistakenly attributed the coinage reforms of ʿAbd al-Malik to Muʿāwiyah instead, this would require a serious error of over 30 years in dating these events when there is no evidence of any other error of this magnitude on the part of the author. Certainly, he does make some chronological errors, such as when he mistakenly dates the accession of Muʿāwiyah as caliph to AG 971, even though it actually occurred in AG 972 (660/1 CE).⁴ Furthermore, he dates the presence of Yazid

3 There have been various attempts to place a more positive interpretation on the deformed cross rather than to admit that it is simply a deformed cross, but these attempts are strained and unconvincing. See, most recently, Heidemann 2010 who interpreted it as a monumental column, a symbol of urban pride.

4 Palmer (1993:31) and Hoyland (1997:138) attempted to defend the accuracy of the author by claiming that he deliberately brought forward the accession of Muʿāwiyah in order to associate it with an earthquake in 659 where this was to be understood as a

b. Mu'āwiyah at the walls of Constantinople to AG 974 (662/3 CE) when this probably occurred as part of the first Arab siege of that city in 667/8.⁵ However, none of this is of the same scale as the alleged redating of the coinage reforms of 'Abd al-Malik by about thirty years.

The purpose of this article is to propose a new interpretation of the allegation that Mu'āwiyah struck gold and silver coins without a cross. One should start any investigation of this topic by asking how the author of the *Maronite Chronicle* knew that it was Mu'āwiyah who had struck these coins in the first place. Since Mu'āwiyah is not known to have placed his name on any other so-called Arab-Byzantine issues, and it appeared only briefly *c.* AH 54–55 on Arab-Sasanian *drachms* from Dārābjird, it seems unlikely that he should have done so in this instance either (*SICA* 1:Pl. 17:245–246). Instead, one suspects that the very fact that these coins did not bear crosses encouraged the assumption that a Muslim had struck them, and that the caliph himself was then identified as the obvious candidate both because he was caliph and because these coins were first noticed in circulation early during his reign. Consequently, the author probably had no firm knowledge as to who had really struck these coins.

The question that needs to be asked next, therefore, is whether a cross, or crosses, were removed from any types of coins in circulation during the early reign of Mu'āwiyah, and not just on the coins struck within the caliphate itself. The answer to this question is that it was about this period that Constans II (641–668) suddenly struck new types of *solidi* and *hexagrams* upon which the three standing figures of his sons replaced the traditional cross on the reverse, the cross-on-steps in the case of the *solidus* and the cross-on-steps-on-globe in the case of the *hexagram*.

Grierson distinguished seven classes of *solidi* struck under Constans II at Constantinople (*DOC* 2/2:403–405, 420–435; Table 1):

Table 1. Classes of *solidi* struck under Constans II at Constantinople

[A']	Obverse	Reverse	Date (CE)
I	Beardless bust	Cross-on-steps	641–647
II	Bust with short beard	Cross-on-steps	647–651
III	Bust with long beard	Cross-on-steps	651–654
IV	Two busts	Cross-on-steps	654–659
V	Two busts	Cross-on-globe between two standing figures	659– <i>c.</i> 661
VI	Two busts	Cross-on-steps between two standing figures	<i>c.</i> 661– <i>c.</i> 663
VII	One bust	Three standing figures on reverse	<i>c.</i> 663–668

sign of divine disapproval at his accession.

5 On the re-dating of Yazid's presence at Constantinople to 667/8, see Jankowiak 2013:57–58.

From the start of the reign of Heraclius I, all precious metal coins featured some form of cross on the reverse so that the type of cross effectively acted as a sort of denominational marker. From that point, the *solidus* had always displayed the cross-on-steps on its reverse (Fig. 1), the *semissis* displayed the cross-on-globe, the *tremissis* displayed the plain cross and the silver *hexagram* (introduced in 615) — the cross-on-globe-on-steps (Fig. 2). Furthermore, these crosses had always been displayed alone as the main feature of the reverse. If one follows Grierson's dating for the moment, Constans II first upset this simple system when he struck *solidi* of Class V above. In this case, the obverse depicts his bust with that of his eldest son Constantine IV, while the reverse depicts a cross-on-globe between the standing figures of his two youngest sons, Heraclius and Tiberius.⁶ In the case of the *solidi* of Class VI, the cross-on-steps returns to the reverse, but with Heraclius and Tiberius standing on either side.⁷ However, it is the *solidi* of Class VII that most interest us here. In this case, the bust of Constans II appears alone on the obverse, so that the reverse now has to accommodate the standing figures of all three of his sons (Fig. 3).⁸ The result is that there is no room for the traditional cross-on-steps, and it disappears altogether. This is not to claim that all crosses have been removed from this type. Each of the three standing figures on the reverse wears a cross on his crown and holds a *globus cruciger* in his right hand. Furthermore, the bust of Constans on the obverse depicts him holding a large *globus cruciger* also. However, the main depiction of the cross on this coin has been removed.



Fig. 1. Class II *solidus* of Constans II with traditional cross-on-steps on reverse. Elsen, Auction 125, June 13, 2015, Lot 641 (2:1 scale)

6 *DOC* 2/2:429-430, Nos. 28a-29g. Two emissions are recognized.

7 *DOC* 2/2:431-433, Nos. 30a-39b. Ten emissions are recognized.

8 *DOC* 2/2:434-435, Nos. 40a-43d. Four emissions are recognized.



Fig. 2. Class II *hexagram* of Constans II with traditional cross-on-globe-on-steps on reverse. Elsen, Auction 125, June 13, 2015, Lot 664 (2:1 scale)



Fig. 3. Class VII *solidus* of Constans II without cross on reverse. Elsen, Auction 125, June 13, 2015, Lot 657 (2:1 scale)

Turning to the standard Byzantine silver coin, the *hexagram*, Grierson identified only five classes of *hexagram* struck at Constantinople under Constans (*DOC* 2/2:437–442; Table 2):⁹

Table 2. Classes of *hexagrams* struck under Constans II at Constantinople

[R]	Obverse	Reverse	Date (CE)
I	Beardless bust	Cross-on-globe-on-steps	641–647
II	Bust with short beard	Cross-on-globe-on-steps	647–651
III	Bust with long beard	Cross-on-globe-on-steps	651–654
IV	Two busts	Cross-on-globe-on-steps	654–659
V	Two busts	Cross-on-globe-on-steps between two standing figures	659–c. 668

⁹ Yannopoulos (1978:26–33) divided the *hexagrams* of Constans II into three types, where he also subdivided the first type into three series, so the result is the same as the classification proposed by Grierson, five distinct groups dated according to the obverse type.

It has always seemed a little odd that the variety of types of *hexagram* did not better match that of the *solidus*, but two new types have recently appeared on the market. That of most interest here depicts a single bust with long beard and *globus cruciger* on the obverse, the same bust as appears on the obverse of *solidi* of Class VII.¹⁰ More importantly, it depicts the same three standing figures on the reverse also. It is clear, therefore, that Constans struck this new type of *hexagram* at about the same time as he did his *solidi* of Class VII type.

Six specimens of this new type have appeared on the market so far (Table 3). They appear to have five different reverse dies and five different obverse dies, where two specimens share the same obverse and reverse dies (Nos. 1 and 6, Table 3). They also seem to divide into two separate stylistic groups where four display finer styles on both obverse and reverse (Fig. 4) and two a cruder style (Fig. 5). The finer style of obverse is identifiable by the fact that a semi-oval badge descends over the emperor's forehead from his helmet. Furthermore, the finer style of reverse depicts a circle or bulge to the right on the lower garment of each of the standing figures (a knee?), where this is entirely absent in the case of the cruder style of reverse. The cruder style of reverse is also distinguishable from the finer style by the disproportionately large size of the heads of the three standing figures. It is noteworthy that neither style of obverse depicts a cross upon the emperor's helmet, where a similar omission distinguishes two of the four emissions of *solidi* of Class VII.¹¹ All specimens display an S in the field to the right of the three figures on the reverse, where the significance of this remains unclear. The same S appears in the field on the reverse of some *hexagrams* of Class III whereas some *hexagrams* of Class IV display the letters B or C, and some of Class V, the letter E instead. One should also note that their weights vary according to their condition and several are chipped or have been struck on irregular flan. Finally, the fact that the six coins all appeared on the market within the same short period suggests that they may derive from the same hoard.¹²

10 The other new type depicts two busts on the obverse, and two standing figures about a cross-on-globe without steps on the reverse, and clearly corresponds to Grierson's Class V of the *solidi* (Gorny & Mosch, Auction 228 March 9, 2015, Lot 755). The fact that it appeared in the same auction as one of the specimens of the type to be discussed here suggests that they share a common origin and may derive from the same hoard.

11 *DOC* 2/2:434–435, where emissions (a) and (b) depict the cross upon the helmet, emissions (c) and (d) do not. If, as Grierson argues, the absence or presence of a cross on the helmet indicates the order of issue, the obvious conclusion is that the *hexagrams* only began to be struck after the first two emissions of *solidi*.

12 Although one cannot totally exclude the possibility that they are modern forgeries without subjecting each coin to a rigorous scientific analysis, this seems unlikely. The fact that none of the coins are die linked tells against this, as does the probability, as argued here, that they are identifiable with the silver coins without crosses attributed by the author of the *Maronite Chronicle* to the caliph Mu'āwiyah.

Table 3. Catalogue of specimens of the new type of *hexagram* without a large cross on the reverse

No.	Publication	Style	Wt. (g); Diam. (mm)
1	Nomos, Auktion 9, October 21, 2014, Lot 320 = Pecunem (Gitbud & Naumann), Auction 30, April 5, 2015, Lot 610 (Fig. 4)	Fine	6.58; 23
2	Rauch, Auktion 96, December 10–12, 2014, Lot 647	Fine	5.97; ?
3	Gorny & Mosch, Auktion 228, March 9, 2015, Lot 756	Fine	6.25; ?
4	Künker, Auktion 262, March 13, 2015, Lot 8474 = Roma Numismatics, E-Sale 18, June 27, 2015, Lot 1210	Crude	6.39; 22
5	Roma Numismatics, Auction IX, March 22, 2015, Lot 905 (Fig. 5)	Crude	6.66; 24
6	Roma Numismatics, Auction X, September 27, 2015, Lot 931	Fine	6.60; 24

Fig. 4. New *hexagram* type of Constans II without cross on reverse, fine style (Pecunem (Gitbud & Naumann), Table 3, No. 1) (2:1 scale)Fig. 5. New *hexagram* type of Constans II without cross on reverse, crude style (Roma Numismatics; Table 3, No. 5) (2:1 scale)

The realization that, during the early years of the reign of Mu'āwiyah, Constans struck a new type of coinage in both gold and silver that abandoned the use of a large cross on the reverse raises the possibility that it was these coins to which the author of the *Maronite Chronicle* referred when he claimed that Mu'āwiyah struck gold and silver coins without a cross. Certainly, these coins were highly unusual by the standards of the time, and would have attracted attention accordingly. The new reverse type depicting the three standing figures was almost identical to the obverse that Heraclius had used on *his* Class IV *solidi* during the period 632–641, and on *his* Class V *miliaresion* and Class II *hexagram* during the period 638–641.¹³ Hence the coins using this new reverse type probably seemed at first to have been struck with two obverse dies, although Constans never actually used an obverse type depicting three standing figures on any of his coins. Furthermore, the former obverse-type under Heraclius seems to have been somewhat controversial in itself at the time. Writing in about 650, John of Nikiu reports a rumor at the time of the death of Heraclius that the use of this obverse type was a bad omen:

And some said: 'The death of Heraclius is due to his stamping the gold coinage with the figures of the three emperors, that is, his own and of his two sons on the right hand and on the left — and so no room was found for inscribing the name of the Roman empire.' And after the death of Heraclius they obliterated these three figures" (John of Nikiu CXVI.3; Translation from Charles 1916:185).

In this context, it would seem almost inevitable that the new coins should have attracted a certain amount of suspicion, particularly within the caliphate where people would naturally have been less well informed as to recent changes within the empire. The obvious suspicion would have been that these coins were forgeries containing a reduced amount of gold or silver, and if, as the *Maronite Chronicle* states, people did not accept these coins, it was probably for this reason rather than for any religious one (so *SICA* I:91). Still, one would not entirely exclude the possibility that some people shunned them for religious reasons, or in the superstitious belief that were ill-omened in some way.

It is important next to ask what evidence there is for the circulation of Constans' new types of *solidus* and *hexagram* within the greater Syrian region. In the case of the *hexagram*, there is none. Indeed, no hexagram of any type seems ever to have been discovered in Israel.¹⁴ Furthermore, it must be suspected that, as already mentioned, the recent examples of this previously unknown type all derive from

13 *DOC* 2/1:258–264, Nos. 33a–50 (*solidi*); 270, No. 60 (*miliaresion*); 274, No. 68 (*hexagram*).

14 Bijovsky 2012a: 358, 374. The fact that no *hexagram* has been discovered in Israel does not mean that they did not circulate in Byzantine Palestine, but it does suggest that their numbers must have been relatively low.

the same unpublished hoard, wherever that was found. In the case of the *solidus*, however, there is good evidence for the circulation of this type within the greater Syrian region, but it is clear that it only ever formed a very small part of what appears to have been a relatively plentiful supply of *solidi* otherwise. For example, the coin hoard deposited at Daphne c. 681 contained 6 *solidi* of Constans II, 3 of Class III, 2 of Class IV and 1 of Class V (Metcalf 1980:91–101). The hoard of *solidi* deposited at Rehob sometime after 686/7 contained nine *solidi* of Constans II, two of Class I, one of Class II (probably), three of Class III, one of Class IV and two of Class VI (Bijovsky 2012b). A hoard of *solidi* deposited near Damascus sometime after 685 contained 18 *solidi* of Constans II, 2 of Class I, three of Class II, seven of Class III, four of Class IV and two of Class VI (Metcalf 1980:102–108). A hoard deposited at Ḥorbat Kab under Constans II contained 22 *solidi* of his reign, two of Class I, seven of Class II, six of Class III, five of Class IV and two of Class VI (Syon 2000–2002). Next, the hoard deposited at Nikertai under Constantine IV contained 155 *solidi* of Constans II, 19 of Class I, 28 of Class II, 23 of Class III, 38 of Class IV, five of Class V, 39 of Class VI and three of Class VII (Morrisson 1972). Finally, the hoard deposited at Bet She'an contained 219 *solidi* of Constans II, 23 of Class I, 20 of Class II, 33 of Class III, 64 of Class IV, five of Class V, 67 of Class VI and seven of Class VII (Bijovsky 2002).

The pattern is clear: *solidi* of Classes V and VII are absent from smaller hoards, and poorly represented even in a large hoard. More importantly here, the fact that there seem to have been as few *solidi* of Class V in circulation in the greater Syrian region as there were of Class VII proves that one does not need to invoke any alleged unpopularity of the Class VII type due to the absence of the cross on its reverse to explain its relative scarcity. The most probable explanation of this phenomenon is that both were struck for much shorter periods than the other classes. Accordingly, Hahn reduced the period during which Class VII *solidi* were struck to about one year, c. 667–668 (*MIB* 3:125–126).

While it is clear that the *solidi* of Class VII were issued during what was probably a relatively short period, it is less clear how one should date this period. Grierson used two criteria to do so. First, he argued that this class of *solidus* corresponded to his *folles* of Class 11 issued at the very end of Constans' reign, "either in Year 24 or (more probably) in Years 26 and 27", and so were presumably issued at about the same time.¹⁵ Secondly, he also argued that the fact that it was the only one of the three classes of *solidi* issued after the promotion of Heraclius and Tiberius as Augusti in 659 not to have been copied at the mints of Carthage and Syracuse pointed to its being the last of these classes to have been struck. Neither argument is persuasive. First, the *folles* of Class 11 do not themselves bear any dates, and

15 *DOC* 2/2:404. He actually refers to *folles* of Class 12, not Class 11, but this must be a typographical error since his analysis of the *folles* (p. 409) ends with Class 11.

there is no firm reason to date them to regnal years 26 and 27 (666–668) as Grierson does. The *folles* of Class 9 bear the regnal years 19, 20, 21 and 23, and those of Class 10 bear the regnal year 25, so that the obvious temptation is to assign the *folles* of Class 11 to a ‘vacant’ year, any of 24, 26 and 27. However, as Grierson’s own analysis makes quite clear, several different classes of *folles* could have been issued simultaneously, so that, for example, *folles* of Classes 5, 6, 7 and 8 were all issued in regnal year 15, and *folles* of Classes 7 and 8 were both issued in regnal year 17. The fact is, therefore, that the *folles* of Class 11 could have been issued at the same time as those of either or both of Classes 9 and 10. However, if one turns to an examination of their iconography instead, some progress seems possible.

Here one notes that the *folles* of Class 9 depict three standing figures on their reverse, whereas the *folles* of Class 10 depict two standing figures on the reverse, that is, that there is a change in the treatment of the sons of Constans during this period. By the time of *folles* of Class 10 Constantine IV has rejoined his father on the obverse, leaving his two brothers alone on the reverse, in a change making it quite clear that he was the intended successor of his father and that his status was not to be confused with that of his brothers. It is highly unlikely, therefore, that he would have agreed to being ‘demoted’ subsequently by having his image returned to that of his brothers. This suggests that the *folles* of Class 11, which depict three imperial busts on the reverse, cannot postdate those of Class 10 and are better associated with those of Class 9. It may be objected at this point that Constantine had been associated with his father on the obverse of *folles* of Class 8 before being demoted to the reverse with his brothers on *folles* of Class 9 starting in 659, and that such a demotion could have occurred again. However, this ignores subsequent political developments. In 659 Constans II was himself in Constantinople to enforce the equal celebration of all three brothers upon the promotion of the younger two as Augusti also, but had left for the West in 662, so that he was no longer able to control his eldest son in the way that he once might have. Indeed, the celebration of all three brothers equally upon the coinage may never have been intended as anything other than a short-term commemoration of the promotion of the younger brothers in 659.

Finally, it is not clear that the *solidi* of Class VII do correspond to the *folles* of Class 11, despite what Grierson says. He seems to base this alleged correspondence on the fact that they share a common obverse, the single bust of Constans with long beard and *globus cruciger*. However, this ignores the fact that the *solidi* of Class VII also share a common reverse with the *folles* of Class 9, the depiction of three standing figures. All things considered, therefore, it makes more sense to date their initial production to the promotion of Heraclius and Tiberius as Augusti in 659. The reason they were not also produced at Carthage and Syracuse may be that they were essentially a sort of commemorative issue. Indeed, the relatively low production of this type at Constantinople itself reinforces this interpretation. Upon the cessation of this type, however, the designers faced a new problem of how to

reintroduce the traditional cross to the reverse of the *solidus* while also continuing to celebrate Heraclius and Tiberius as Augusti, although not with the same status as their brother or father. Hence the cross was reintroduced to the reverse on the *solidi* of Class V, but the cross-on-globe was substituted for the cross-on-steps in order, as Grierson himself argues, to prevent the reverse from becoming too crowded as the cross was squeezed in between the standing figures of Constans' two younger sons (*DOC* 2/2:429). However, this design was not a success and was quickly abandoned for *solidi* of Class VI depicting the traditional cross-on-steps between the two standing figures, where the steps were much narrower than previously. The result was not particularly elegant, but it did serve to reassure the public by restoring the traditional style of cross, that is, the correct denominational mark, to the *solidus* once more.

It is my argument, therefore, that Grierson's classification of the *solidi* and *hexagrams* of Constans II needs to be revised. In the case of the *solidi*, the order of his existing classes needs to be changed so that his final three classes now run Class VII, Class V and Class VI and should be renumbered accordingly (Table 4). In the case of the *hexagrams*, recent discoveries require the acknowledgement of two new classes so that the evolution in their type precisely matches that of the *solidi* (Table 5). Here one notes that Grierson, followed by Hahn, used the evidence of the second Asclepeion hoard from Athens (1877) to date the start of Class VI to about 662.¹⁶ The assumption was that this hoard was probably buried during Constans II's visit there, so the fact that it contained a large number of *solidi* of Class VI proved that they must have begun to be struck by 662. This left Grierson and Hahn with a problem in that the hoard also seemed to contain a *solidus* of Class VII which they wished to date to a later period (667/8 according to Hahn), so they were then forced to claim that this *solidus* had not really formed part of the hoard at all. The present reordering of the Classes allows one to retain the probable date for the burial of the hoard without having to search for some reason to exclude the single *solidus* of Class VII. Hence the *solidi* of Grierson's Classes VII and V were probably struck during the period 659–661, with those of his Class VI coming to dominate the coinage by late 662.

16 *DOC* 2/2:404; *MIB* 3:125. On this hoard, see Morrisson, Popović and Ivani/Rević 2006:227–228 who date it about 668 on the basis of its inclusion of a single *solidus* of Class VII.

Table 4. Revised classification of *solidi* struck under Constans II at Constantinople

[A/]	Obverse	Reverse	Date (CE)	Grierson's Class
I	Beardless bust	Cross-on-steps	641–647	I
II	Bust with short beard	Cross-on-steps	647–651	II
III	Bust with long beard	Cross-on-steps	651–654	III
IV	Two busts	Cross-on-steps	654–659	IV
V	One bust	Three standing figures on reverse	659–c. 660	VII
VI	Two busts	Cross-on-globe between two standing figures	c. 660–661	V
VII	Two busts	Cross-on-steps between two standing figures	c. 661–c. 668	VI

Table 5. Revised classification of *hexagrams* struck under Constans II at Constantinople

[R/]	Obverse	Reverse	Date (CE)	Grierson's Class
I	Beardless bust	Cross- on-globe-on-steps	641–647	I
II	Bust with short beard	Cross- on-globe-on-steps	647–651	II
III	Bust with long beard	Cross- on-globe-on-steps	651–654	III
IV	Two busts	Cross- on-globe-on-steps	654–659	IV
V	One bust	Three standing figures on reverse	659–c. 660	-
VI	Two busts	Cross-on-globe between two standing figures	c. 660–661	-
VII	Two busts	Cross-on-globe-on-steps between two standing figures	c. 661–c. 668	V

In conclusion, the redating of *solidi* of Grierson's Class VII to 659, combined with the discovery that *hexagrams* of the same type were also struck, means that these coins may have just begun to circulate within Syria by the time of the accession of Mu'āwiyah as caliph in 661. This coincidence, combined with the apparent attempt to de-Christianize these coins by the removal of the large cross from the reverse in each case, was probably enough to cause a popular rumor that the caliph himself had issued these coins. The claim by the author of the *Maronite Chronicle* that Mu'āwiyah struck coins in gold and silver without a cross probably reflects this popular rumor. Consequently, his testimony is better interpreted as evidence for the date of Constans' *solidi* of Grierson's Class VII, and the newly discovered *hexagrams* of the same type, than as evidence in support of a class of Arab-Byzantine coinage that has proven almost impossible to detect otherwise.

REFERENCES

- Bates M. 1992. Commentaire sur l'étude de Cécile Morrisson. In P. Canivet and J.-P. Rey-Coquais eds. *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam*. Damascus. Pp. 319–321.
- Bijovsky G. 2002. A Hoard of Byzantine Solidi from Bet She'an in the Umayyad Period. *RN* 158:161–227.
- Bijovsky G. 2012a. *Gold Coin and Small Change: Monetary Circulation in Fifth–Seventh Century Byzantine Palestine* (Polymnia Numismatica antica e medievale. Studi 2). Trieste.
- Bijovsky G. 2012b. A Byzantine Gold Hoard from Rehob (H. Parwa). *INR* 7:147–158.
- Charles R.H. 1916. *The Chronology of John, Bishop of Nikiu*. R.H. Charles transl. London.
- Foss C. 2002. A Syrian Coinage of Mu'awiya? *RN* 158:353–365.
- Foss C. 2008. *Arab-Byzantine Coins. An Introduction, with a Catalogue of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection*. Washington, D.C.
- Foss C. 2010. Mu'awiya's State. In J. Haldon ed. *Money, Power and Politics in Early Islamic Syria: A Review of Current Debates*. Farnham. Pp. 75–96.
- Heidemann S. 2010. The Standing Caliph-Type—The Object on the Reverse. In A. Oddy ed. *Coinage and History in the Seventh Century Near East 2*. London. Pp. 23–34.
- Hoyland R.G. 1997. *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It*. Princeton.
- Hoyland R.G. 2015. *In God's Path: The Arab Conquests and the Creation of an Islamic Empire*. New York.
- Ilisch L. 2007. The Muhammad-Drachms and Their Relation to Umayyad Syria and Northern Mesopotamia. In *Coinage and History in the Seventh Century Near East* (Supplement to Journal of the Oriental Numismatic Society 193). London. Pp. 17–24.
- Jankowiak M. 2013. The First Arab Siege of Constantinople. *Travaux et Mémoires* 17:1–80.
- Marshall A. 2013. The Architecture of Allegiance in Early Islamic Late Antiquity: The Accession of Mu'awiya in Jerusalem. In A. Beihammer, S. Constantinou, and M. Parani eds. *Court Ceremonies and Rituals of Power in Byzantium and the Medieval Mediterranean: Comparative Perspectives*. Leiden. Pp. 87–112.
- Metcalf W.E. 1980. Three Seventh-Century Byzantine Gold Hoards. *MN* 25:87–108.
- Morrisson C. 1972. Le trésor byzantin de Nikertai. *Revue Belge de Numismatique* 118:29–91.
- Morrisson C. 1992. Le monnayage omeyyade et l'histoire administrative et économique de la Syrie. In P. Canivet and J.-P. Rey-Coquais eds. *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam* (Damascus). Pp. 309–318.
- Morrisson C., Popović V and Ivaničević V. 2006. *Les Trésors monétaires byzantins des Balkans et d'Asie Mineure (491–713)*. Paris.
- Palmer A. 1993. *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles*. Liverpool.
- Syon D. 2000–2002. A Hoard of Byzantine Solidi from Ḥurvat Kab. *INJ* 14:211–223.
- Yannopoulos P. 1978. *L'hexagramme, un monnayage byzantine en argent du VII^e siècle*. Louvain-La-Neuve.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AJC* Y. Meshorer *Ancient Jewish Coinage*. Dix Hills, NY 1982
- AJN* *American Journal of Numismatics*
- BMC* e.g., *BMC Arab.*: G.F. Hill. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Persia*. London 1922
- BMCO* e.g., *BMCO 1*: S. Lane-Poole. *The Coins of the Eastern Khaleefehs in the British Museum. Catalogue of the Oriental Coins in the British Museum 1*. London 1875
- CH* *Coin Hoards*
- CHL* Y. Meshorer, G. Bijovsky and W. Fischer-Bossert. *Coins of the Holy Land: The Abraham and Marian Sofaer Collection at the American Numismatic Society and the Israel Museum*. Ed. by D. Hendin and A. Meadows. New York 2013
- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
- CNP* e.g., L. Kadman. *The Coins of Akko Ptolemais* (*Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium IV*). Jerusalem 1961
- CRE* e.g., H. Mattingly. *The Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum I. Augustus to Vitellius*. London 1923
- DOC* e.g., P. Grierson. *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection 3. Leo III to Nicephorus III 717–1081*. Washington, D.C. 1973
- IEJ* *Israel Exploration Journal*
- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae*
- IGCH* M. Thompson, O. Mørkholm and C.M. Kraay. *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards*. New York 1973
- INJ* *Israel Numismatic Journal*
- INR* *Israel Numismatic Research*
- LA* *Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Liber Annuus*
- LRBC* e.g., P.V. Hill and J.P.C. Kent. Part 1: The Bronze Coinage of the House of Constantine, A.D. 324–46. In *Late Roman Bronze Coinage (A.D. 324–498)*. London 1965. Pp. 4–40
- MIB* e.g., W. Hahn. *Von Anastasius I. bis Justinianus I (491–565)*. *Moneta Imperii Byzantini 1*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften 109. Veröffentlichungen der Numismatischen Kommission 1. Vienna 1973
- MIBE* W. Hahn. *Money of the Incipient Byzantine Empire (Anastasius I–Justinian I, 491–565)* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte der Universität Wien 6). Vienna 2000
- MIBEC* W. Hahn and M. Metlich. *Money of the Incipient Byzantine Empire Continued (Justin II—Revolt of the Heraclii, 565–610)*. (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte der Universität Wien 13). Vienna 2009
- MN* *American Numismatic Society Museum Notes*
- NC* *Numismatic Chronicle*
- NCirc.* *Numismatic Circular*
- NNM* *Numismatic Notes and Monographs*
- RIC* e.g., C.H.V. Sutherland. *The Roman Imperial Coinage I. From 31 BC to AD 69*. London 1984
- RN* *Revue Numismatique*
- RPC* e.g., A. Burnett, M. Amandry and I. Carradice. *From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69–96). Roman Provincial Coinage 2*. London 1999
- RRC* M.H. Crawford. *Roman Republican Coinage*. Cambridge 1974
- SC* e.g., A. Houghton and C. Lorber. *Seleucid Coins. A Comprehensive Catalogue. Part I. Seleucus I through Antiochus III*. New York, Lancaster, PA-London 2002
- SICA* e.g., S. Album and T. Goodwin. *Sylloge of Islamic Coins in the Ashmolean 1: The Pre-Reform Coinage of the Early Islamic Period*. Oxford 2002
- SNAT* e.g., L. Ilisch. *Sylloge Nummorum Arabicorum Tübingen–Palästina IVa Bilād aš-Šām I*. Tübingen 1993
- SNG* *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* (with suffix as necessary, e.g. *SNG Cop.*)
- SNR* *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau*
- TINC* *Transactions of the International Numismatic Congress*
- TJC* Y. Meshorer. *A Treasury of Jewish Coins from the Persian Period to Bar Kochba*. Jerusalem-Nyack 2001
- ZfN* *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*